

Daniel Feinberg—CA Bar No. 135983
 Todd F. Jackson—CA Bar No. 202598
 Margaret E. Hasselman—CA Bar No. 228529
 Nina Wasow—CA Bar No. 202047
 LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE,
 RENAKER & JACKSON, P.C.
 1330 Broadway, Suite 1800
 Oakland, California 94612
 Telephone: (510) 839-6824
 Facsimile: (510) 839-7839
 Email: dfeinberg@lewisfeinberg.com
 Email: tjackson@lewisfeinberg.com
 Email: mhasselman@lewisfeinberg.com
 Email: nwasow@lewisfeinberg.com

Ronald Lovitt, CA Bar No. 040921
 J. Thomas Hannan, CA Bar No. 039140
 Henry I. Bornstein, CA Bar No. 75885
 LOVITT & HANNAN, INC.
 900 Front Street, Suite 300
 San Francisco, California 94111
 Telephone: (415) 362-8769
 Facsimile: (415) 362-7528
 Facsimile: (415) 362-7528
 Email: hib@lh-sf.com

*Attorneys for Defendants K-M Industries
 Holding Co., Inc.; K-M Industries Holding
 Co. ESOP Plan Committee; and CIG ESOP
 Plan Committee*

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class
 (Additional counsel on signature page)

(Additional counsel on signature page)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO AND OAKLAND DIVISION

THOMAS FERNANDEZ and LORA SMITH,
 individually and on behalf of a class of all other
 persons similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

K-M INDUSTRIES HOLDING CO., INC.;
 K-M INDUSTRIES HOLDING CO., INC.
 ESOP PLAN COMMITTEE; WILLIAM E.
 AND DESIREE B. MOORE REVOCABLE
 TRUST; TRUSTEES OF THE WILLIAM E.
 AND DESIREE B. MOORE REVOCABLE
 TRUST; CIG ESOP PLAN COMMITTEE;
 NORTH STAR TRUST COMPANY;
 DESIREE B. MOORE REVOCABLE TRUST;
 WILLIAM E. MOORE MARITAL TRUST;
 WILLIAM E. MOORE GENERATION-
 SKIPPING TRUST; and DESIREE MOORE,
 BOTH IN HER INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY
 AND AS TRUSTEE OF THE WILLIAM E.
 AND DESIREE B. MOORE REVOCABLE
 TRUSTS SUCCESSOR TRUSTS NAMED
 ABOVE,

Defendants.

Case No. C-06-07339 MJJ

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT
 STATEMENT**

Date: August 28, 2007
 Time: 2:00 p.m.
 Courtroom: 11

1 Pursuant to the Court's scheduling order dated June 22, 2007, the parties jointly submit this
2 Case Management Statement.

3 **I. Status of Litigation.**

4 The parties have been pursuing discovery in the weeks since the Court entered the last
5 scheduling order. The parties have met and conferred regarding document production by all three
6 sets of Defendants and have resolved many discovery issues. Depositions of witnesses by
7 Plaintiffs were originally scheduled for late July and August.

8 However, Defendants have encountered difficulties that were unanticipated at the time of
9 the June 22, 2007 scheduling order, and the previously scheduled depositions have been
10 postponed. Although the KM Defendants (K-M Industries Holding Co., Inc., K-M Industries
11 Holding Co., Inc. ESOP Plan Committee and CIG ESOP Plan Committee) have been working to
12 respond to Plaintiffs' discovery requests, the KM Defendants have not yet been able to complete
13 their production of documents in hard copy form, and have not yet produced any electronically
14 stored information (ESI) in response to Plaintiffs' requests for production of documents.

15 Defendant North Star Trust Co. also has not completed hard copy production or produced
16 any ESI. North Star Trust Co.'s hard copy production had been delayed by the KM Defendants'
17 request to review a large portion of North Star's documents prior to production, pursuant to a Joint
18 Defense Agreement in another action. The Joint Defense Agreement covers certain documents in
19 North Star's possession as to which the KM Defendants have stated that they may wish to assert
20 privilege, work product or confidentiality protection. Subject to the Court's approval, the parties
21 have agreed, however, that North Star Trust Co. will produce such documents but North Star
22 Trust Co. or the KM Defendants may later assert such privileges or protections to the extent
23 otherwise permissible by law. Once that agreement is executed and approved by the Court, North
24 Star Trust Co. will produce its hard copy documents in short order.

25 The Moore Trust Defendants (all defendants other than North Star and the KM
26 Defendants) have asserted that their production is complete. Plaintiffs and the Moore Trust
27 Defendants are in the process of meeting and conferring on certain aspects of the Moore Trust
28 Defendants' production, but no additional large volume of production is expected.

1 With respect to the production of the hard copy documents, Plaintiffs and the K-M
2 Defendants have met and conferred concerning the K-M Defendants' objections that Plaintiffs'
3 document requests are overbroad. While Plaintiffs and the K-M Defendants have not been able to
4 completely resolve their differences, they have agreed upon categories of hard copy documents
5 that will be produced by the K-M Defendants, and the K-M Defendants are in the final stages of
6 producing these documents. The production of these hard copy documents has been delayed in
7 part because although these documents are technically in the possession, custody and control of
8 the K-M Defendants, they are in reality in the possession of other law firms that have formerly
9 represented the K-M Defendants. Coordinating discovery with these other law firms has
10 significantly slowed the process of collecting, reviewing and producing these documents.

11 Most of the delay that has occurred in producing documents by the K-M Defendants has
12 related to the challenges presented by the production of ESI. The KM Defendants are in the
13 process of harvesting data from which their production of ESI will occur, and the parties have met
14 and conferred concerning the scope of the production. However, the KM Defendants currently do
15 not know how large the volume of production will be. Plaintiffs and Defendants have been
16 meeting and conferring regarding an agreement about the protocol to be used to provide an
17 efficient and cost-effective method of winnowing the relevant documents from the vast number of
18 irrelevant documents.

19 Plaintiffs have been reviewing documents as they are produced by all Defendants, and
20 have been meeting and conferring on an ongoing basis with each set of Defendants regarding
21 their production of documents. Not all issues are resolved, but the parties have made steady
22 progress with resolving discovery disputes without court intervention.¹ The volume of
23 documents produced in this litigation is high (more than 80,000 pages thus far), however, and

24 ¹ The KM Defendants have agreed to produce many documents that they listed on their privilege
25 logs pursuant to a stipulation that has been submitted to the Court for approval limiting the scope
26 of any waiver created by that production. They have further agreed to update their privilege logs
27 for those documents that they are withholding pursuant to the attorney-client privilege, providing
28 more information on their position on those documents. Once Plaintiffs have that information,
Plaintiffs will very likely move to compel the production of certain documents on that log.
Plaintiffs will bring this motion as soon as possible, i.e., as soon as the parties' positions on the
privilege status of all documents have been determined.

review and discussion with opposing counsel has been time-consuming.

In addition to the large number of hard copy documents that have been and will be produced, the KM Defendants and North Star anticipate that an even larger number of electronic documents may be responsive.

All parties agree that for the sake of efficiency, Plaintiffs should not take depositions until after Plaintiffs have had an opportunity to review all documents and ESI produced in response to their document requests. If Plaintiffs take depositions without access to all responsive documents and ESI, witnesses may need to be deposed more than once, increasing the inconvenience and expense for all involved. Due to the still-incomplete production and the fact that the volume of ESI to be produced by the KM Defendants and North Star is still unknown, therefore, the parties agree that Plaintiffs should have several weeks to review all documents produced by Defendants before starting depositions.

For all these reasons, the current litigation schedule has become unworkable due to the unanticipated difficulties with production of documents and the resulting lack of complete information flowing to Plaintiffs. Therefore, the parties jointly request a modification of the current scheduling order to accommodate the need to complete discovery before the Court hears motions, including the planned motion for class certification and motion for summary judgment on statute of limitations grounds.

Therefore, the parties request that the Court adopt the following proposed schedule.

II. Proposed Schedule.

In light of the issues outlined in the prior section, the parties jointly propose the following schedule to govern the remainder of this litigation:

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. Deadline for production of ESI and hard copy documents by North Star Trust Co. | October 31, 2007 |
| 2. Deadline for production of ESI and hard copy documents by all other Defendants | December 31, 2007 |
| 3. Case Management Conference to inform the Court whether Defendants have met the deadlines for production of ESI and hard copy documents. | January 8, 2008 |

| | | |
|----|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | 4. Last day to hear motions to compel regarding written discovery responses and production of documents | April 29, 2008 |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | 5. Close of fact discovery | July 28, 2008 |
| 4 | 6. Deadline for hearings on motions for class certification and for summary judgment on statute of limitations grounds | September 30, 2008 |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | 7. Disclosure of identity of experts and exchange of expert reports | December 19, 2008 |
| 7 | 8. Deadline for rebuttal expert reports | January 16, 2009 |
| 8 | 9. Close of expert discovery (depositions) | February 16, 2009 |
| 9 | 10. Deadline for hearing on dispositive motions | April 21, 2009 |
| 10 | 11. Pretrial Conference | According to the Court's availability |
| | 12. Trial date | According to the Court's availability |

11 Dated: August 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

12 LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE,
13 RENAKER & JACKSON, P.C.

14 By: /s/
Margaret E. Hasselman

15 Peter Rukin—CA State Bar No. 178336
16 RUKIN HYLAND DORIA
& TINDALL LLP

17 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*
18 *and the Proposed Class*

19 Dated: August 21, 2007

LOVITT & HANNAN, INC.

20 By: /s/
Henry Bornstein
21 *Attorneys for Defendant K-M Industries*
22 *Holding Co., Inc.; K-M Industries Holding*
23 *Co., Inc. ESOP Plan Committee; and CIG*
24 *ESOP Plan Committee*

25
26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 Dated: August 21, 2007

HENNIGAN, BENNETT & DORMAN LLP

2
3 By: /s/

Robert L. Palmer
*Attorneys for Defendant William E. and
Desiree B. Moore Revocable Trust; Desiree
B. Moore Revocable Trust; William E.
Moore Marital Trust; William E. and
Desiree B. Moore Revocable Trust
Generation-Skipping Trust; and Desiree
Moore*

4
5
6
7
8 Dated: August 21, 2007

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

9
10 By: /s/

Nicole Diller
*Attorneys for Defendant North Star Trust
Company*